UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/522,552	08/12/2005	Takashi Imaeda	265122US90PCT	8489

22850   7590   01/28/2008
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
LODHI, ANDALIB FT

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2163	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
01/28/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/522,552	IMAEDA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andalib F. Lodhi	2163	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _November 8th, 2007_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _2,3,5,6,9,10 and 14-23_ is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _2,3,5,6,9,10 and 14-23_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☒ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim **9** is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 9 recites "the program comprising: instructing..; performing...; generating...;". Exerminer suggest to change the language for this limitation 'the program comprising' to 'the program causing the computer to execute a step comprising'.

Response to Amendment

1.   This Office Action is in response to applicant's communication filed November 8th, 2007. The Applicant's remarks and amendments to the claims and/or the specification were considered with the results that follow.

2.   In response to the last Office Action, claims 2, 3, 5, 9, 10, 14-16 and 19-22 have been currently amended. Claims 1, 4, 7, 8 and 13 have been canceled. Claims 11 and 12 have previously been cancelled. Claim 23 has been newly added. As a result, claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10 and 14-23 are now pending in this application.

3.   Rejection of claims 1-7, 9-10 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 101 has been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments filed September 19, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. At pages 12-14, concerning claim 2, Firstly, Applicant argued that <u>Subramaniam</u>

does not describe "making, in the proxy process server apparatus, a database process request

to a database access control apparatus, and that the database access control apparatus

performs a process on the database in response to the database process request from the

proxy process server apparatus, and sends a process result to the proxy process server

apparatus.

As to the above argument, Examiner respectfully submit that Subramaniam et al. teaches,

'making, in the proxy process server apparatus, a database process request to a database

access control apparatus (see e.g. Fig. 1, refs. 112, 104 and 106 and col. 8 lines 13-46, **note**

that a initial request for access to the target server), and that the database access control

apparatus performs a process on the database in response to the database process request

from the proxy process server apparatus (see .e.g. col. 9 lines 44-67 and col. 10 lines 1-19,

note that proxy server corresponds to transformer have caching capability to perform the

process), and sends a process result to the proxy process server apparatus (see e.g. col. 9

lines 32-35, **note that transmit** *'Web Pages, file'* **refers as 'process result' to the** *'border*

server' **as 'proxy process server')'**.

Secondly, Applicant argued that," Katano Guthrie does not describe that a database

access control apparatus determines whether an access key the same as the access key

received from the proxy process server apparatus exists in the storing part and executes an

access to data in the database within a limit permitted for the user ID corresponding to the

access key only if the access key exists in the storing part".

As to the above argument, Examiner respectfully submits that Guthrie et al. teaches, "the

access key being generated by the database access control apparatus based on a user ID of

the user apparatus (see e.g. col. 5 lines 51-64 and , **note that** *communication session including*

user ID' refers as 'access key' is stored session data, where database server accesses

the information of session data and stores in a context *'data structure'* refers as 'storing

part')".

Subramaniam et al. teach all limitation for claim 1. However they do not explicitly show

that 'the access key being generated by the database access control apparatus based on a user

ID of the user apparatus'. The SSL protocol uses session ID to communication. The session ID

is the access key as in claim 1, by using SSL reference, because the Subramniam et al.

implement the SSL protocol.

Claims 3, 14-16 depend on independent claim 2. Each of the identified dependent claims

are also rejected.

Claims 5-6 and 17-19 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 2.

Claims 9-10 and 20-22 are rejected for the same reasons as claims 2.

Claim 23 is rejected for the same reasons as claims 2.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Regarding claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 9, 10 and 14-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Subramaniam et al. (Patent no.: 6081900) in view of Kitano Guthrie et al.

(Patent no.: 6606627 B1).

Regarding claim **2**, Subramaniam et al. teach:

A database access control method for performing access control on a database in response to a

request from a user apparatus through cooperation between a database access control

apparatus and a proxy process server apparatus (see e.g. Abstract), comprising:

sending, in the database access control apparatus, an address of a usable proxy process server

apparatus to the user apparatus in response to the request from the user apparatus (see

e.g.col.3 lines 19-33, col.4 lines 45-50 and col.5 lines 38-49, **note that in the** *'secure network*

servers' **refers here as** 'proxy server within the border server' **and clients are connected by**

IP link);

connecting the user apparatus to the proxy process server apparatus of the address to make a

database access request (see e.g. col. 4, lines 58-64, **note that user makes a database**

access request);

making, in the proxy process server apparatus, a database process request to the database

access control apparatus according to the database access request from the user apparatus

(see e.g. Fig. 1, refs. 112, 104 and 106 and col.8 lines 13-46 and col. 6 lines 61-62, **note that a**

initial request form the client ser for access to the target server);

performing, in the database access control apparatus, a process on the database in response to

the database process request from the proxy process server apparatus (see .e.g. col. 9 lines

44-67 and col. 10 lines 1-19, and lines 5-35, **note that proxy server corresponds to**

transformer have caching capability to perform the process), and sends a process result to

the proxy process server apparatus (see e.g. col. 9 lines 32-35 and col. 9 lines 44-56 and col.10

lines 5-35, **note that transmit** *'Web Pages, file'* **refers as 'process result' to the** *'border*

server' **as 'proxy process server')**; and

performing, in the proxy process server apparatus, an additional process on the process result

sent from the database access control apparatus (see e.g. col. 10 lines 20-66 and col. 11 lines

1-13, **note that performs an additional process)**, and sending an additional process result to

the user apparatus (see e.g. col. 11 lines 14-21, **note that sends the result for additional**

process to the client);

sending, in the user apparatus, the access key to the proxy process server apparatus when

making the database access request to the proxy process server apparatus (see e.g. col. 11

lines 40-67, **note that** *'session identifier'* **refers here as 'access key')** ;

sending, in the proxy process server apparatus, sends the access key to the database access

control apparatus when making the database process request to the database access control

apparatus (see e.g. col. 8 lines 47-57 and col. 11 lines 65-67) ; and

determining, in the database access control apparatus, whether an access key the same as the

access key received from the proxy process server apparatus exists in the storing part (see e.g.

col. 8 lines 47-57 and col. 11 lines 65-67 and col. 12 lines 33-46, **note that border server**

notify user if ' access key' refers as user name and password' are validated by the

authentication system within the secure network) and executes an access to data in the

database within a limit permitted for the user ID corresponding to the access key only if the

access key exists in the storing part (see e.g. col. 10 lines 56-67 to col. 11 lines 1-2 and lines

34-39).

However, Subramaniam et al. do not explicitly show that 'the access key being generated by the database access control apparatus based on a user ID of the user apparatus'.

Guthrie et al. discloses in their invention 'the access key being generated by the database access control apparatus based on a user ID of the user apparatus (see e.g. col. 5 lines 48-64 and , **note that** *'communication session including user ID'* **refers as 'access key' is stored session data, where database server accesses the information of session data and stores in a context** *'data structure'* **refers as 'storing part')'**; and

Subramaniam et al. and Guthrie et al. are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of accessing secure data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to receive an access key and a database access request from the user apparatus as taught by Guthrie et al. in order to reduce the cost of managing application by sharing the resources.

Claim **23** recites the limitations of claims 2, thus are rejected for the same reasons stated in claims 2 discussed above.

For claim **3**, Subramaniam et al. teach:
in the database access control apparatus, whether the user apparatus is in a state of being connected to the proxy process server apparatus in addition to performing determination of the access key (see e.g. col. 8 lines 40-50), and performing the access to the data in the database

only if the user apparatus is in the state of being connected to the proxy process server

apparatus (see e.g. col. 8 lines 50-53).

Claims **6 and 10** recite the limitations of claims 3, thus are rejected for the same reasons stated

in claims 3 discussed above.

Regarding claim **5**, Subramaniam et al. teach:

A database access control apparatus for performing access control on a database in response

to a request from a user apparatus through cooperation with a proxy process server apparatus,

comprising:

means for instructing the user apparatus to connect to the proxy process server apparatus by

sending an address of a usable proxy process server apparatus to the user apparatus in

response to a request from the user apparatus (see e.g.col.3 lines 19-33, col.4 lines 45-50 and

col.5 lines 38-49, **note that in the secure network servers and clients are connected by IP

link**);

means for performing a process on the database in response to a database process request

from the proxy process server apparatus (see e.g. col.10 lines 5-35, **note that caching

perform the process**), and sending a process result to the proxy process server apparatus

(see e.g. col. 10 lines 36-40, **note that sending request to the proxy server**);

sending the access key to the user apparatus when sending the address of the proxy process

server apparatus to the user apparatus (see e.g. col. 11 lines 14-21);

means for receiving the access key and the database process request from the proxy process

sever server apparatus (see e.g. col. 11 lines 40-67, **note that** *'session identifier'* **refers here

as 'access key'**), and

determining whether an access key the same as the access key received from the proxy

process server apparatus exists in the storing part (see e.g. col. 8 lines 47-57 and col. 11 lines

65-67 and col. 12 lines 33-46, **note that border server notify user if ' access key' refers as**

user name and password' are validated by the authentication system within the secure

network); and means for executing an access to data in the database within a limit permitted for

the user ID corresponding to the access key only if the access key exists in the storing part (see

e.g. col. 10 lines 56-67 to col. 11 lines 1-2 and lines 34-39).

However, Subramaniam et al. do not ecplicitly show, 'the access key being generated by

the database access control apparatus based on a user ID of the user apparatus';

Guthrie et al. discloses in their invention 'the access key being generated by the database

access control apparatus based on a user ID of the user apparatus (see e.g. col. 5 lines 51-64

and , **note that** *'communication session including user ID'* **refers as 'access key' is stored**

session data, where database server accesses the information of session data and

stores in a context *'data structure'* **as 'storing part')'**; and

Subramaniam et al. and Guthrie et al. are analogous art because they are from the same

field of endeavor of accessing secure data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to receive an access key and a database access request from the user apparatus as

taught by Guthrie et al. in order to reduce the cost of managing application by sharing the

resources.

Claim **9** recites the limitations of claims 5, thus are rejected for the same reasons stated in claims 5 discussed above.

For claim **14**, Subramaniam et al. teach:

overwriting or erasing, in the database access control apparatus, the access key stored in the storing part after performing the process on the database in response to the database process request from the proxy server apparatus (see e.g. col. 8 lines 58-67 and col. 9 lines 1-10).

Claims **17 and 20** recite the limitations of claims 15, thus are rejected for the same reasons stated in claims 14 discussed above.

For claim **15**, Subramaniam et al. teach:
overwriting or erasing, in the database access control apparatus, the access key stored in the storing part when the database access control apparatus is accessed by the user apparatus next (see e.g. col. 8 lines 58-67 and col. 9 lines 1-10).

Claims **18 and 21** recite the limitations of claims 15, thus are rejected for the same reasons stated in claims 15 discussed above.

For claim **16**, Subramaniam et al. teach:
overwriting or erasing, in the database access control apparatus, the access key stored in the storing part when the database access control apparatus receives a next request from the user apparatus (see e.g. col. 8 lines 58-67 and col. 9 lines 1-10).

Claims **19 and 22** recite the limitations of claims 16, thus are rejected for the same reasons

stated in claims 16 discussed above.

Conclusion

6.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR

1.136(a).

7.   A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS

from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the

mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the

THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on

the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will

be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the

statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8.   The examiner requests, in response to this Office action, support be shown for language

added to any original claims on amendment and any new claims. That is, indicate support for

newly added claim language by specifically pointing to page(s) and line no(s) in the specification

and/or drawing figure(s). This will assist the examiner in prosecuting the application.

9.   When responding to this office action, Applicant is advised to clearly point out the

patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present, in view of the state of the art

disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. He or she must also show how the

amendments avoid such references or objections See 37 CFR 1.111(c).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Andalib F. Lodhi whose telephone number is (571) 270-1759. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:00am-5:00pm, EST Alt Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on (571) 272-1834. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published

applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information

for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information

about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on

access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-

217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA

OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

January 11th, 2007

DON WONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Andalib Lodhi
AU: 2163